

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

T-277 P.12/21 F-692

FEB 27 2008

Application No.: 10/671,022  
Attorney Docket No.: 72167.000461**REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 7, 8, 13, 16, 19, 21 are amended. No new matter has been added by this amendment. Support for the present amendments to the claims may be found in the application on paragraphs 0037-0039, 0050 and in Figures 4 and 5, for example (with reference to the paragraph numbering of the published patent application 2004/0230441). Reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

**A. The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections**

The Office Action rejects claims 2-4 and 7-21 as being unpatentable over Silva in view of multiple combinations of four other references. Specifically, the Office Action provides the following bases for rejection for the various claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

- **Claims 2-4:** Silva in view of U.S. Patent 5,784,058 by LaStrange et al. (LaStrange).
- **Claims 7, 11, 12, 19 and 20:** Silva in view of U.S. Patent 7,203,909 by Horvitz et al (Horvitz).
- **Claims 8-10:** Silva in view of Horvitz and in further view of LaStrange.
- **Claims 13, 14 and 21:** Silva in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0021862 by Schroeder et al. (Schroeder) and Horvitz.
- **Claim 15:** Silva in view of Schroeder and Horvitz as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of LaStrange.
- **Claims 16-18:** Silva in view of Schroeder and Horvitz as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,052,730 by Felciano et al. (Felciano).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Application No.: 10/671,022  
Attorney Docket No.: 72167.000461

**Per claim 7**, on page 5 the Office Action rejects this claim as being unpatentable over Silva in view of Horvitz. Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 7 is amended and currently recites:

"identifying the content on a web site not containing the web page, wherein the identifying includes a user interface through which a user selects portions of the content on the web site, and the user interface includes input fields to name and organize the selected portions, and preset menu to select the portions."

Applicant submits that the applied art fails to teach or suggest the interface feature as recited in claim 7. Rather, Silva depicts relatively complicated code that points to web content (see Silva Figure 2) or requires a program to record a user's browsing in order to emulate that browsing at a later time (see Silva paragraph 0027, for example).

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 7 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests withdraw of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103.

**Per claim 8**, on page 9 the Office Action rejects this claim as being unpatentable over Silva in view of Horvitz and in further view LaStrange. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 8 is amended and currently recites:

"wherein if the structure of the retrieved different content does not match the stored structure, the method further comprising performing an action in response to the difference, where the action is pre-selected by the user through the user interface, and the user interface includes a choice of actions including: generating a new window; and displaying the retrieved different content in a new window."

Applicant submits that the applied art fails to teach where a user can define actions taken in response to a mismatch between the structure of the retrieved content and the stored structure, as recited in claim 8. The Office Action alleges:

Application No.: 10/671,022  
Attorney Docket No.: 72167.000461

"Silva in view of Horvitz further discloses that if the structure of the retrieved different content does not match the stored structure, a notification is sent and the structure will re-described (In Silva: Page 5 [0043]) which would require retrieving the content and displaying it in a browser window (In Silva: Page 3 [0025])."

The cited portion of Silva states:

"Even though the heuristics that have been developed are robust to minor changes in the page structure, they can still break if the page structure changes radically. In such cases, a mechanism to detect and report errors to the client is needed so that during replay, if the Web view player is not able to locate an object involved in a recorded action, it suspends the replay and notifies the user. The user may then re-record the smart bookmark (to correct the problematic step) before the corresponding Web view is used again. Similarly, if the result of applying the XPath extraction expression to the final page returns nothing, the system reports "not found". Depending on what is sought, this may be an error. It may also mean that what is sought--e.g., a column by a particular columnist--may not be available at present, but might well be tomorrow. It is also possible that the XPath expression returns an undesired object (if the page structure changes radically). In such cases, the user may need to correct the extraction expression."

Silva, paragraph 0043. The above portion of Silva teaches a method that reports "not found" if an extraction expression returns nothing, for example. Applicant submits that Silva does not teach or suggest where *a user can define a response action through the interface* as recited in claim 8.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 8 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests withdraw of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103.

**Per claim 13**, on page 10 the Office Action rejects this claim as being unpatentable over Silva in view of Schroeder and Horvitz. Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 13 is amended and currently recites:

"storing a list of at least one proscribed Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) and a corresponding alternative URL, wherein the corresponding URL contains an alternative set of information to the proscribed URL"

Application No.: 10/671,022  
Attorney Docket No.: 72167.000461

The Office Action alleges:

"Schroeder teaches storing a list of proscribed URLs and corresponding alternative URLs (Page 4 [0054]). This allows the corresponding alternative URL to be activated when the proscribed URL is selected (Page 4 [0054]-[0056]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Silva and modify it as indicated by Schroeder such that the method further comprises storing a list of at least one proscribed Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) and a corresponding alternative URL, identifying the content on a different web page, the content containing the at least one proscribed URL, and activating the corresponding alternative URL if the at least one proscribed URL is selected."

Applicant traverses this assertion on two bases. Firstly, Schroeder does not teach the claim as amended, especially "wherein the corresponding URL contains an alternative set of information to the proscribed URL." Rather, Schroeder teaches rerouting a browser to a more convenient content provider *in order to access the very same content*. Specifically, Schroeder teaches: "an improvement in network reliability using link modification." Schroeder, paragraph 0047.

Schroeder elaborates:

"the inventors have further realized that directing web requests to the content delivery providers can be controlled by the links within a web page. The inventors change these links to direct web requests to the most-reliable or lowest-cost provider at any given time... Since the choice of the content delivery provider is made just before the web page is sent from the company's server to the browser, the most available content delivery provider at that instant in time can be chosen. When one content delivery provider fails, traffic can immediately and automatically be re-directed to another content delivery provider" [Emphasis added].

Schroeder, paragraphs 0049 and 0051. Thus, Schroeder merely teaches redirecting a browser to the same content through a different content provider. Therefore, the link modification taught in Schroeder is fundamentally different than "activating the corresponding alternative URL if the at least one proscribed URL is selected," where "the corresponding URL contains an alternative set of information to the proscribed URL," as recited in claim 13.

Application No.: 10/671,022  
Attorney Docket No.: 72167.000461

Secondly and relatedly, Applicant traverses the rejection for lack of motivation. The Office Action alleges: "One would be motivated to have this, as it is desirable to be able to redirect requests depending on a variety of factors (In Schroeder: Page 2 [0022])." The cited paragraph of Schroeder provides factors that would not have motivated the combination of art asserted in the Office Action. Schroeder states in paragraph 0022:

"While such link editing is useful, it is desired to modify links on-the-fly as web pages are served to the client. It is desired to modify these links to re-direct web requests to one of several content delivery providers, depending on factors such as user location, network availability, cost, and failures."

"User location, network availability, cost and failures" would not motivate a modification of Silva in accordance with Schroeder to teach or suggest the features of claim 13, i.e. the motivations of "user location, network availability, cost and failures" would not motivate one skilled in the art to redirect a user of Silva to a corresponding URL to access alternative information. In other words, Applicant submits (for purposes of this argument only) that the cited portion of Schroeder provides a motivation for modifying Silva to perform the processing of Schroeder, as the association between Schroeder's processing and such motivation is expressly set forth by Schroeder. However, as discussed above, the teachings of Schroeder are fundamentally different from the processing recited in claim 13. Thus, no motivation is provided to result in the claimed invention, but rather Schroeder's processing.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 13 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests withdraw of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103.

**Per claim 16**, on page 16 the Office Action rejects this claim as being unpatentable over Silva in view of Schroeder, Horvitz and Felciano. Applicant respectfully traverses. The Office Action alleges that Felciano teaches "a URL that contains information not customized for the user can

Application No.: 10/671,022  
Attorney Docket No.: 72167.000461

be substituted with a alternative URL that contains information customized for the user (Col. 6 line 63 - Col. 7 line 23).” Applicant submits that Felciano fails to teach claim 16 as amended: “wherein the corresponding alternative URL contains information customized for the user.” The cited portion of Felciano states:

“Of particular importance is the use of the technique to modify a browsing experience by layering or stripping hypertext content which changes the visible content or functionality of the original hypertext. The particular type of layering or stripping can be dynamically configured depending on the individual user and the specific document being accessed. For example, a user with a low-bandwidth connection to the internet may want to surf the web with all graphics images above 30K in size eliminated. The CGI program then selectively modifies URLs to provide only the smaller images to that particular client. Another user may want links to conversion programs automatically inserted next to links to various types of binary files. Links of various types could be inserted into documents and selected in real-time depending on the profile of an individual user and the content of the particular web page being requested. Yet another type of content enhancement is to embed convenient links within pages at appropriate locations. For example, for every link to a Postscript file on a web page, Lamprey can replace it with, or insert an additional link to a Postscript-to-PDF-converter CGI that includes a pointer to the original Postscript file as a parameter. Because most browsers cannot display Postscript, but can display PDF, the user is provided with convenient access to web resources that would otherwise be very difficult to view. Thus, Lamprey can customize the web experience of a user by selectively and intelligently substituting URLs and other HTML” [Emphasis added].

The link modification taught in Felciano is fundamentally different than the features recited in claim 16. Felciano teaches the modification of a URL to provide a smaller image or links to conversion programs, for example. In other words, Felciano provides a method for “convenient access to web resources that would otherwise be very difficult to view.” Thus, if a browser would have difficulty accessing the information contained in a URL, then Felciano provides a mechanism for enabling access to that *same information*. Felciano fails to teach, however, redirecting the browser to *alternative information*. Specifically, Felciano fails to teach

Application No.: 10/671,022  
Attorney Docket No.: 72167.000461

redirecting a user to an alternative URL containing information customized for the user as recited in claim 16.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 16 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests withdraw of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Per claim 18, on page 17 the Office Action rejects this claim as being unpatentable over Silva in view of Schroeder, Horvitz and Felciano. The Office Action alleges that Felciano "teaches wherein corresponding alternative URL contains customized pricing information (In Felciano: Col. 7 lines 24-43)." Applicant respectfully traverses. In particular, Applicant submits that the Office Action appears to mischaracterize claim 18. Applicant believes that the Office Action's allegation is based particularly on the following applied portion of Felciano:

"The gateway server, for example, can be used as a "toll booth" that allows access to and charges for access to various web content.... The key benefit to this approach is that the content provider can be organizationally and technically separate from the toll collector.... This arrangement also has the advantage that the content vendors do not need to register users, limit access in complicated ways, or keep track of charges. The advantage to the users, on the other hand, is that they obtain easy access to data from a variety of different content providers through registration with and payment to the single gateway site."

The applied portion of Felciano hardly relates to the feature of the invention recited in claim 18. Felciano teaches a server that functions as a central "toll booth" that *charges users for access to various web content*. The system disclosed in Felciano is wholly different from the URL that *contains customized pricing information* as recited in claim 18. Applicant submits that the claim language clearly recites a different concept than Felciano teaches, and understands that patentability depends on the invention recited in the claims. However, for illustrative purposes

Application No.: 10/671,022  
Attorney Docket No.: 72167.000461

only, Applicant points to paragraphs 0050 and 0051 in the published application for examples of pricing information.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 18 is deficient and the claim is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests withdraw of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103.

**Per claim 19**, on page 7 the Office Action rejects this claim as being unpatentable over Silva in view of Horvitz. Applicant respectfully traverses. Applicant submits that claim 19 is amended to recite features of the invention regarding a proscribed URL and a corresponding alternative URL, similar to those features recited in claim 13. Further, claim 19 is amended to recite features of the invention regarding a user interface similar to those features recited in claim 7. Applicant therefore incorporates herein the aforementioned arguments regarding patentability for those two claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 19 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests withdraw of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103.

**Per claim 21**, on page 12 the Office Action rejects this claim as being unpatentable over Silva in view of Schroeder and Horvitz. Applicant respectfully traverses. Applicant submits that claim 21 is amended to recite features of the invention regarding a proscribed URL and a corresponding alternative URL, similar to those features recited in claim 13. Applicant therefore incorporates herein the aforementioned arguments regarding patentability for claim 13.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 21 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests withdraw of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103.



RECEIVED +  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

T-277 P.20/21 F-692

FEB 27 2008

Application No.: 10/671,022  
Attorney Docket No.: 72167.000461

**B. The 35 U.S.C. 102 Rejection Based on Silva**

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0054090 by Silva et al. (Silva).

Per claim 1, on page 3 the Office Action alleges that Silva discloses each and every element of the claim. Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion. Applicant notes that claim 1 is amended and currently recites features of the invention regarding a proscribed URL and a corresponding alternative URL, similar to those features recited in claim 13. Therefore, the previous rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 is moot, and Applicant further incorporates the aforementioned arguments regarding patentability for claim 13.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests withdraw of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102.

**C. Dependent Claims**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of the dependent claims, including those that are not addressed above. Applicant submits that the dependent claims recite patentable subject matter for at least reasons similar to those set forth above, as well as the additional features such dependent claims recite.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the dependent claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests withdraw of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102-103.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
FEB 27 2008

Application No.: 10/671,022  
Attorney Docket No.: 72167.000461

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons outlined above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully solicited.

For any fees due in connection with filing this Response the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

Dated: 2-27-08

By: \_\_\_\_\_

James B. Miner  
Registration No. 40,444  
Anders P. Fjellstedt  
Registration No. 61,311

Hunton & Williams LLP  
Intellectual Property Department  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)  
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)